```
f260seca
1
2
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3
 4
      SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
      COMMISSION,
5
                     Plaintiff,
6
                 v.
                                                15 CV 894
 7
      CALEDONIAN BANK LTD.,
8
      CALEDONIAN SECURITIES, LTD.,
      CLEAR WATER SECURITIES, INC.,
9
      LEGACY GLOBAL MARKETS, S.A.,
      and VERDMONT CAPITAL, S.A.,
10
                      Defendant.
11
12
                                                New York, N.Y.
                                                February 6, 2015
13
                                                11:31 A.M.
14
      Before:
15
                         HON. WILLIAM H. PAULEY III,
16
                                                District Judge
17
18
      APPEARANCES
19
      Securities and Exchange Commission (DC)
20
      BY: Richard Edward Simpson
           A. David Williams
21
           Ernesto Amparo
22
23
24
25
```

(In the robing room)

THE COURT: Good morning, have a seat. This is an ex parte application. Would counsel for the SEC give their appearance for the court reporter.

MR. SIMPSON: Richard Simpson for the Securities and Exchange Commission. And with me is Ernesto Amparo. He's also with the SEC. And, Vennia Francios also, a paralegal working with us on the case.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning to all of you.

This case has just been wheeled out to me. I would ask, Mr. Simpson, that you give me a very brief summary of the case. At the moment, just a quick overview, because here's what I have in mind. You have given me all of the papers, but I don't have a copy of the complaint. And I will need, I want to review the papers. I have two oral arguments that are waiting for me in the courtroom, and I'm prepared to see you again after I have reviewed the papers at about 1:15 this afternoon, if that works for you folks.

MR. SIMPSON: Yeah, that works.

THE COURT: But I'll let you give me a quick Readers
Digest tease about the case right now, and provide me with a
copy of the complaint.

MR. SIMPSON: Okay. Let me do the easiest one first. This is the copy of the complaint.

THE COURT: Great.

MR. SIMPSON: This is a case that involved four pump and dump transactions where outside foreign entities sold penny stocks into the United States markets. The penny stocks were issued by, basically, shell companies that didn't have any real assets or revenues. The defendants that we're suing are the actual sellers of the stocks into the markets. It includes a Cayman Islands bank, a brokerage firm in Panama, and two so-called brokerage firms in Belize. These entities sold the stocks directly to American investors and made tens of millions of dollars selling the stock.

Even though it is a pump and dump, we're only suing on the grounds of Section 5 of the Securities Act, which is a strict liability statute that basically says that if you sell securities into the United States without a registration statement being in effect with respect to your sales, then you're liable under Section 5 to return the proceeds of those sales. So we're suing basically on a Section 5 basis against these entities.

THE COURT: And, in essence, what is the nature of the emergency ex parte application.

MR. SIMPSON: Okay, we have located two substantial accounts for two of the defendants in the United States. With respect to one of the defendants, there was substantial movement of assets last September, shortly after an indictment was handed down with respect to one of the other defendants in

our case, Legacy Global. So that asset transfer was effected by Caledonian Bank.

Another defendant, Verdmont Capital, just this past January, on January 5 and 6th, liquidated an account that had approximately \$37 million in it of securities. There is \$17 million worth of securities still in the U.S. But the other 17 or 20 million has been transferred to foreign entities, or to the credit of foreign entities. So those transfers cause us concern. And the real emergency is that if the defendants get notice of this lawsuit before there is an asset freeze, then they will also transfer these substantial assets out of the United States, since they are all foreign entities.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Please come back at 1:15 and we'll entertain the application ex parte.

MR. SIMPSON: Okay, very well.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SIMPSON: Okay. Is it okay if we leave boxes of documents with exhibits, can we leave those in the courtroom.

THE COURT: You can leave them in the courtroom. My deputy will tell you where to leave them so that they are safe.

MR. SIMPSON: Okay, good. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you very much. See you at 1:15.

MR. SIMPSON: Okay, thanks.

We also have these file-stamped originals of the 1 2 exhibits. Do you want us to just keep those? 3 THE COURT: One set, or multiple sets? 4 MR. SIMPSON: One set. But you don't have to read 5 every page. Three volumes of brokerage account statements showing the defendant's sales, and then four volumes of the 6 7 underlying documents that are summarized in our papers, showing 8 the pump and dump scheme. 9 THE COURT: Leave them on the table. I'm in awe. 10 MR. SIMPSON: Okay, thank you, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 (Recess) 13 MR. SIMPSON: Good afternoon. 14 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Simpson. 15 MR. SIMPSON: I brought in reinforcements. This is Mr. Williams from the SEC. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, Mr. Williams. 18 All right, I have had an opportunity to take a quick 19 look at your motion papers. 20 Could you just explain to me what the need is to 21 require repatriation within five days of notice of receipt of 22 the order. 23 MR. SIMPSON: Repatriation, I think, would mostly be a 24 backstop to the asset freeze. In other words, if we got an 25 asset freeze with respect to the two defendants who have assets

here in the U.S., most likely a repatriation order would not be necessary. And probably it wouldn't necessarily have to be done within five days, it would be maybe a longer period.

With respect to two of the defendants, Clearwater and Legacy Global, we have not yet located assets in the U.S. that are equal to the amounts that they are exposed to in this litigation. So a repatriation order would be, I think, more appropriate directed toward them.

THE COURT: Now, in looking at the attachment to Mr. Amparo's declaration, it appears to me that, at least as recently as earlier this week, according to a screenshot of an account, that there is \$17,745,515 in an interactive broker's account, in Greenwich, Connecticut.

MR. SIMPSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Is that --

MR. AMPARO: Yes. Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So what I would like to understand is, who you do intend to serve with this restraining order on accounts?

MR. SIMPSON: Interactive brokers. Then the Northern Trust International Banging Corporation, which holds assets in the name of Caledonian Bank. And then the defendants, we would serve, hopefully pursuant to alternative means which we're seeking.

THE COURT: I am prepared to grant your alternative means order.

MR. SIMPSON: Okay.

THE COURT: And my question is other than those two financial institutions that you have just identified, what other financial institutions do you intend to serve with the order at this time?

MR. SIMPSON: At this time, the only other one would be Scottsdale Advisors, which is a brokerage firm in Arizona, which holds \$59,000. But those would be the only three.

THE COURT: And presuming that the Court signs this order, now, is it the SEC's intention to serve those financial institutions literally forthwith?

MR. SIMPSON: Yes.

THE COURT: What about service on the defendants?

MR. SIMPSON: I would go to the office first thing tomorrow morning and attempt service by e-mail.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let me -- is there any reason why once you have affected service on the financial institutions and confirmed that they have received the Court's order and taken the action as directed, that you couldn't serve the defendants via the alternative service order?

MR. SIMPSON: We could probably serve the order this afternoon by e-mail. And, then, the other papers, logistically, we could attempt that, but that might be a little bit more difficult, because we would have to PDF a lot of the documents.

THE COURT: All right. And once again, just for the sake of this record, would you set forth the reasons why it is imperative that the SEC restrain these accounts, now, without notice to any of the account holder defendants?

MR. SIMPSON: I think that it's our conclusion, based on the circumstances, and the transfers that have happened before, that the defendants are likely to move assets out of the U.S. if they have notice of this action.

They are all foreign entities; one in the Cayman Islands, one in Panama, and two in Belize, so that they doesn't have actual stakes in the U.S. And it's very easy to move assets out of bank accounts or brokerage accounts at a moment's notice of litigation. And then, also, just the history of this case recently, where there were transfers of assets by Verdmont in early January, and then transfers of assets by Caledonian Bank in September of 2014.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else that the SEC believes that the Court should be aware of before it acts on this proposed order?

MR. SIMPSON: Yeah, in terms of the exposure to the assets, I can't think of anything else, other than what we have set forth in our papers, and what I have already said. And then, in addition, regarding I guess the facts of the case and the law pertaining to Section 5, we can basically rest on the papers we have submitted.

THE COURT: All right. Under Rule 65, I'm going to grant the SEC's application. I plan to be out of the district for a period of time. Under Rule 65, a temporary restraining order cannot extend beyond 14 days, unless there is agreement of the parties or a further application to the court.

So I will set the matter down, by way of a return date for February 20th, which is 14 days from today, at 10:00. And I will provide that the defendants shall serve any opposition papers in this matter by February 17th. With any reply from the Commission, by close of business on February 19th. The Commission and the defendants are directed to follow the individual practices of this court and to provide a paper copy to chambers of any electronic filings that are made with the court. The record should reflect that I am entering this order on February 6th at 1:30 p.m., EST.

Is there anything further at this time?

MR. SIMPSON: One thing is we need to speak with your courtroom deputy about collecting the stamped copies of the court documents.

THE COURT: All right. We can deal with all of that off the record.

My final direction will be that the Commission obtain a copy of this transcript and provide this transcript to the defendants after the Commission serves the defendants with the pleadings in this case.

MR. SIMPSON: We'll do that, your Honor. 1 THE COURT: All right. Anything else? 2 3 MR. SIMPSON: No, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Thank you very much. I'll see you on the 20th. 5 6 Do you anticipate that you're going to be hearing from 7 the defendants? MR. SIMPSON: I expect we'll be hearing from them 8 9 rather shortly. At least, from Caledonian and Verdmont. 10 THE COURT: And does Caledonian Bank conduct business 11 in the United States, or have a correspondent bank in the 12 United States? 13 MR. SIMPSON: I believe so, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Very well. 15 And if the parties wish to proceed on the 20th, we 16 will -- I'll need to know, in advance, so the appropriate 17 arrangements can be made, assuming that there is no request for 18 adjournment by the defendants. 19 MR. SIMPSON: Very well, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Very well. Thank you very much. Have a 21 good afternoon. 22 MR. SIMPSON: Thank you. 23 THE COURT: Wait in the courtroom and we'll provide 24 this material to you in a moment. 25 (Adjourned)